Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

Deterministic Joint Remote Preparation of a Four-qubit Cluster-type State via GHZ states

Hai-bin Wang · Xiao-Yan Zhou · Xing-xing An · Meng-Meng Cui · De-sheng Fu

arXiv:1602.02065v1 [quant-ph] 5 Feb 2016

Received: August 2, 2015 / Accepted: date

Abstract A scheme for the deterministic joint remote preparation of a four-qubit cluster-type state using only two Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states as quantum channels is presented. In this scheme, the first sender performs a two-qubit projective measurement according to the real coefficient of the desired state. Then, the other sender utilizes the measurement result and the complex coefficient to perform another projective measurement. To obtain the desired state, the receiver applies appropriate unitary operations to his/her own two qubits and two $CNOT$ operations to the two ancillary ones. Most interestingly, our scheme can achieve unit success probability, i.e., P_{suc}=1. Furthermore, comparison reveals that the efficiency is higher than that of most other analogous schemes.

Keywords Deterministic Joint Remote Preparation · four-qubit cluster-type state · Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger(GHZ) state · Unit success probability

H.-B. Wang (✉)
Jiangsu Engineering Center of Network Monitoring, Nanjing University of Information Science & Technology, Nanjing 210044, P. R. China
E-mail: whb787716@163.com

H.-B. Wang · M.-M. Cui · D.-S. Fu
School of Computer and Software, Nanjing University of Information Science & Technology, Nanjing 210044, P. R. China
E-mail: whb787716@163.com

X.-Y. Zhou
Jiangsu Key Laboratory of Meteorological Observation and Information Processing, Nanjing 210044, P. R. China

X.-Y. Zhou · X.-X. An
School of Electronic and Information Engineering, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, Nanjing 210044, P. R. China

1 Introduction

With the rapid development of quantum information technology in recent decades, quantum entanglement has begun to play a very critical role as a physical resource. Many quantum information protocols have been developed based on quantum mechanics principles, including quantum key distribution [1,2], quantum secure direct communication [3,4], quantum teleportation (QT) [5,6], and quantum private comparison [7-9]. Especially in QT, the preparer can transfer an unknown quantum state to a remote receiver using classical information and quantum resources. A major characteristic of QT is that the preparer knows nothing about the state. In the last decade, Lo [10], Pati [11] and Bennett et al. [12] reported a new quantum communication scheme that uses classical communication and a previously shared entangled resource to remotely prepare a quantum state. This scheme is called remote state preparation (RSP). Similar to QT, in RSP, the preparer can exploit the nonlocal correlation of the quantum entangled state that is shared in advance to prepare the remote desired state. The main difference is that in RSP, the preparer must know all the state information, while in QT, the preparer knows nothing about the state. To date, because RSP has potential value in quantum communication, it has been widely studied, and many RSP protocols have been proposed [13,14].

The early RSP protocols focused on the case of one preparer and one receiver, in which the preparer knows all the desired state information. However, it is unreliable that one one preparer holds all the information, especially this information is very important and highly sensitive. To overcome this issue, joint remote state preparation (JRSP) was developed. In 2007, Xia et al. [15] proposed the novel JRSP protocol, which realized the multiparty remote preparation of an arbitrary one-qubit state. Since then, many JRSP schemes have been presented, including the preparation of one-qubit [16-18], two-qubit [19-21], and three-qubit states [22-24].

Recently, some researchers have begun to focus on more complicated four-qubit cases using a variety of methods. For instance, in 2011, Zhan et al. [25] investigated JRSP for a four-qubit cluster-type state with six Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen(EPR) pairs and two six-qubit entangled states (ZHM11 for short), and subsequently, An et al. [26] proposed a different scheme that only requires the projective measurement of two qubits and fewer classical bits (ABD11). Moreover, some researchers have attempted to prepare cluster-type states using partially entangled states as quantum channels. In 2012, Wang et al. [27] addressed this issue using two quaternate partially entangled states as quantum channels (WY12). In 2013, Wang et al. [28] exploited a new and feasible scheme to perform JRSP of four-qubit cluster-type states based on tripartite non-maximal entanglements and positive operator-valued measurement (WY13). Additionally, Hou [29] proposed a scheme for JRSP of four-qubit cluster-type states using only two-qubit entangled states as the quantum channel (H13), which he then extended to the multiparty case. Unfortunately, these protocols are probabilistic and therefore cannot be realized with unit suc-

cess probability. To solve this problem, by tactically constructing two sets of projective measurement bases, i.e., the real-coefficient measurement basis and the complex-coefficient measurement basis, a new deterministic JRSP scheme with GHZ states is proposed. In this scheme, the first sender performs a two-qubit projective measurement based on the real coefficient of the desired state. Then, the other sender performs another projective measurement utilizing the measurement result and the complex coefficient. To obtain the desired state, the receiver applies appropriate unitary operations to his/her own two qubits and two $CNOT$ operations to the two ancillary ones. This JRSP scheme can be successfully realized with unit success probability.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we propose a new scheme for joint remotely preparing a four-qubit cluster-type state and provide a detailed description. We analyze the correctness of the protocol in the third section. Finally, a concise summary is given in the last section.

2 Deterministic JRSP of a four-qubit cluster-type state via GHZ states

Without loss of generality, suppose there are three parties–two senders Alice and Bob and one receiver Charlie–and the senders cooperate to prepare a four-qubit cluster-type state for the receiver,

$$|\phi\rangle = a|0000\rangle + be^{i\theta_1}|0011\rangle + ce^{i\theta_2}|1100\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}|1111\rangle, \tag{1}$$

where a, b, c, d and θ_i (i=1,2,3) are real and meet the normalized condition $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + d^2 = 1$. Additionally, Alice and Bob have partial knowledge of the desired state $|\phi\rangle$; that is, Alice only knows the real coefficients a, b, c and d, while Bob knows the complex coefficient θ_i. In this scenario, neither Alice nor Bob can individually help Charlie to reconstruct the desired state.

Suppose the quantum channel shared by Alice, Bob and Charlie consists of two GHZ states,

$$|Q\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)_{123} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)_{456}, \tag{2}$$

where qubits 1 and 4 belong to Alice, qubits 2 and 5 belong to Bob, and qubits 3 and 6 belong to Charlie (see Fig. 1).

To help Charlie remotely prepare the desired state, the detailed four-step protocol can be described as below:

Step 1 Alice performs a two-qubit projective measurement on her own qubits 1 and 4. Here, the measurement bases are a set of mutually orthogonal basis vectors constructed using the real part $\{a, b, c, d\}$ as below,

$$\begin{pmatrix} |u_0\rangle_{14} \\ |u_1\rangle_{14} \\ |u_2\rangle_{14} \\ |u_3\rangle_{14} \end{pmatrix} = U(a, b, c, d) \begin{pmatrix} |00\rangle_{14} \\ |01\rangle_{14} \\ |10\rangle_{14} \\ |11\rangle_{14} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3}$$



Fig. 1: **The schematic distribution of qubits used to establish the correlation among the participants in our scheme.**

where

$$U\left(a,b,c,d\right)=\begin{pmatrix} a & b & c & d \\ b & -a & d & -c \\ c & -d & -a & b \\ d & c & -b & -a \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

Then, Eq. (2) can be rewritten as

$$|Q\rangle=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{m=0}^{3}|u_m\rangle_{14}|L_m\rangle_{2536}, \tag{5}$$

where

$$|L_0\rangle_{2536}=(a|0000\rangle+b|0101\rangle+c|1010\rangle+d|1111\rangle)_{2536}, \tag{6}$$

$$|L_1\rangle_{2536}=(b|0000\rangle-a|0101\rangle+d|1010\rangle-c|1111\rangle)_{2536}, \tag{7}$$

$$|L_2\rangle_{2536}=(c|0000\rangle-d|0101\rangle-a|1010\rangle+b|1111\rangle)_{2536}, \tag{8}$$

$$|L_3\rangle_{2536}=(d|0000\rangle+c|0101\rangle-b|1010\rangle-a|1111\rangle)_{2536}. \tag{9}$$

Alice transmits her measurement result to both Charlie and Bob.

Step 2 Using m and the complex part θ_i, Bob constructs a set of mutually orthogonal basis vectors of qubits 2 and 5:

$$\begin{pmatrix} |v_0\rangle \\ |v_1\rangle \\ |v_2\rangle \\ |v_3\rangle \end{pmatrix}=G^{(m)}\begin{pmatrix} |00\rangle \\ |01\rangle \\ |10\rangle \\ |11\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

where

$$G^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & e^{-i\theta_1} & e^{-i\theta_2} & e^{-i\theta_3} \\ 1 & -e^{-i\theta_1} & e^{-i\theta_2} & -e^{-i\theta_3} \\ 1 & -e^{-i\theta_1} & -e^{-i\theta_2} & e^{-i\theta_3} \\ 1 & e^{-i\theta_1} & -e^{-i\theta_2} & -e^{-i\theta_3} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{11}$$

$$G^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\theta_1} & 1 & e^{-i\theta_3} & e^{-i\theta_2} \\ e^{-i\theta_1} & -1 & e^{-i\theta_3} & -e^{-i\theta_2} \\ e^{-i\theta_1} & -1 & -e^{-i\theta_3} & e^{-i\theta_2} \\ e^{-i\theta_1} & 1 & -e^{-i\theta_3} & -e^{-i\theta_2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{12}$$

$$G^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\theta_2} & e^{-i\theta_3} & 1 & e^{-i\theta_1} \\ e^{-i\theta_2} & -e^{-i\theta_3} & 1 & -e^{-i\theta_1} \\ e^{-i\theta_2} & -e^{-i\theta_3} & -1 & e^{-i\theta_1} \\ e^{-i\theta_2} & e^{-i\theta_3} & -1 & -e^{-i\theta_1} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{13}$$

$$G^{(3)} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\theta_3} & e^{-i\theta_2} & e^{-i\theta_1} & 1 \\ e^{-i\theta_3} & -e^{-i\theta_2} & e^{-i\theta_1} & -1 \\ e^{-i\theta_3} & -e^{-i\theta_2} & -e^{-i\theta_1} & 1 \\ e^{-i\theta_3} & e^{-i\theta_2} & -e^{-i\theta_1} & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{14}$$

In terms of these measurement bases, $|L_m\rangle_{2536}$ can be expressed in the form

$$|L_m\rangle_{2536} = \sum_{n=1}^{3} |v_n\rangle_{25} |D_{mn}\rangle_{36}; \tag{15}$$

here, $|D_{mn}\rangle_{36}$ represents the final states of qubits 3 and 6. Bob performs the projection measurement on qubits 2 and 5 and sends the result n ($n = 0, 1, 2, 3$) to Charlie.

Step 3 According to the measurement results m and n, Charlie utilizes unitary operators R_{mn} (shown in Table 2) to transfer $|D_{mn}\rangle_{36}$ to the below state,

$$|T\rangle_{36} = (a|00\rangle + be^{i\theta_1}|01\rangle + ce^{i\theta_2}|10\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}|11\rangle)_{36}. \tag{16}$$

Step 4 Charlie prepares two ancillary qubits 7 and 8, denoted as $|00\rangle_{78}$, and then applies two controlled-NOT gates $CNOT_{3,7}$ and $CNOT_{6,8}$ to qubits 3, 6, 7 and 8. Here, qubits 3 and 6 are the control qubits and qubits 7 and 8 are the target ones. As a result, he obtains the desired four-qubit cluster-type states as below,

$$\begin{aligned} &CNOT_{36}CNOT_{78}|T\rangle_{36}|00\rangle_{78} \\ &\quad = CNOT_{36}CNOT_{78}(a|00\rangle + be^{i\theta_1}|01\rangle + ce^{i\theta_2}|10\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}|11\rangle)_{36}|00\rangle_{78}\,. \\ &\quad = a|0000\rangle + be^{i\theta_1}|0011\rangle + ce^{i\theta_2}|1100\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}|1111\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The whole process of our four-step JRSP protocol is summarized in Fig. 2.

Table 1: **The unitary operation of qubits 3 and 6.**

m	n	$\|D_{mn}\rangle_{36}$	R_{mn}
0	0	$a\|00\rangle + be^{i\theta_1}\|01\rangle + ce^{i\theta_2}\|10\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}\|11\rangle$	$I_3 \otimes I_6$
	1	$a\|00\rangle - be^{i\theta_1}\|01\rangle + ce^{i\theta_2}\|10\rangle - de^{i\theta_3}\|11\rangle$	$I_3 \otimes Z_6$
	2	$a\|00\rangle - be^{i\theta_1}\|01\rangle - ce^{i\theta_2}\|10\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}\|11\rangle$	$Z_3 \otimes Z_6$
	3	$a\|00\rangle + be^{i\theta_1}\|01\rangle - ce^{i\theta_2}\|10\rangle - de^{i\theta_3}\|11\rangle$	$Z_3 \otimes I_6$
1	0	$be^{i\theta_1}\|00\rangle - a\|01\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}\|10\rangle - ce^{i\theta_2}\|11\rangle$	$I_3 \otimes Z_6X_6$
	1	$be^{i\theta_1}\|00\rangle + a\|01\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}\|10\rangle + ce^{i\theta_2}\|11\rangle$	$I_3 \otimes X_6$
	2	$be^{i\theta_1}\|00\rangle + a\|01\rangle - de^{i\theta_3}\|10\rangle - ce^{i\theta_2}\|11\rangle$	$Z_3 \otimes X_6$
	3	$be^{i\theta_1}\|00\rangle - a\|01\rangle - de^{i\theta_3}\|10\rangle + ce^{i\theta_2}\|11\rangle$	$Z_3 \otimes Z_6X_6$
2	0	$ce^{i\theta_2}\|00\rangle - de^{i\theta_3}\|01\rangle - a\|10\rangle + be^{i\theta_1}\|11\rangle$	$Z_3X_3 \otimes Z_6$
	1	$ce^{i\theta_2}\|00\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}\|01\rangle - a\|10\rangle - be^{i\theta_1}\|11\rangle$	$Z_3X_3 \otimes I_6$
	2	$ce^{i\theta_2}\|00\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}\|01\rangle + a\|10\rangle + be^{i\theta_1}\|11\rangle$	$X_3 \otimes I_6$
	3	$ce^{i\theta_2}\|00\rangle - de^{i\theta_3}\|01\rangle + a\|10\rangle - be^{i\theta_1}\|11\rangle$	$X_3 \otimes Z_6$
3	0	$de^{i\theta_3}\|00\rangle + ce^{i\theta_2}\|01\rangle - be^{i\theta_1}\|10\rangle - a\|11\rangle$	$Z_3X_3 \otimes X_6$
	1	$de^{i\theta_3}\|00\rangle - ce^{i\theta_2}\|01\rangle - be^{i\theta_1}\|10\rangle + a\|11\rangle$	$Z_3X_3 \otimes Z_6X_6$
	2	$de^{i\theta_3}\|00\rangle - ce^{i\theta_2}\|01\rangle + be^{i\theta_1}\|10\rangle - a\|11\rangle$	$X_3 \otimes Z_6X_6$
	3	$de^{i\theta_3}\|00\rangle + ce^{i\theta_2}\|01\rangle + be^{i\theta_1}\|10\rangle + a\|11\rangle$	$X_3 \otimes X_6$

3 Correctness and efficiency analysis

3.1 Correctness analysis

Assuming Alice receives the measurement result $m = 1$, Bob chooses the measurement basis according to the strategy of step 2

$$\begin{pmatrix} |v_0\rangle \\ |v_1\rangle \\ |v_2\rangle \\ |v_3\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\theta_1} & 1 & e^{-i\theta_3} & e^{-i\theta_2} \\ e^{-i\theta_1} & -1 & e^{-i\theta_3} & -e^{-i\theta_2} \\ e^{-i\theta_1} & -1 & -e^{-i\theta_3} & e^{-i\theta_2} \\ e^{-i\theta_1} & 1 & -e^{-i\theta_3} & -e^{-i\theta_2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |00\rangle \\ |01\rangle \\ |10\rangle \\ |11\rangle \end{pmatrix}. \tag{18}$$



Fig. 2: **The procedure of our scheme for the deterministic joint remote preparation of a four-qubit cluster-type entangled state with three parties.** (a) Alice performs a two-qubit projective measurement on her own qubits 1 and 4 and sends the measurement result m to both Bob and Charlie. (b) Bob performs a projection measurement on qubits 2 and 5 and sends the result n to Charlie. (c) According to measurement results m and n, Charlie applies unitary operations to qubits 3 and 6. (d) Charlie prepares two ancillary qubits 7 and 8 and then applies two controlled-NOT gates to qubits 3, 6, 7 and 8 to obtain the desired state.

We can rewrite $|L_1\rangle_{2536}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}|L_1\rangle_{2536} &= \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{n=1}^{3}|v_n\rangle_{25}|D_{1n}\rangle_{36}\\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}|v_0\rangle_{25}\big(be^{i\theta_1}|00\rangle - a|01\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}|10\rangle - ce^{i\theta_2}|11\rangle\big)_{36}\\ &+ \tfrac{1}{2}|v_1\rangle_{25}\big(be^{i\theta_1}|00\rangle + a|01\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}|10\rangle + ce^{i\theta_2}|11\rangle\big)_{36}\\ &+ \tfrac{1}{2}|v_2\rangle_{25}\big(be^{i\theta_1}|00\rangle + a|01\rangle - de^{i\theta_3}|10\rangle - ce^{i\theta_2}|11\rangle\big)_{36}\\ &+ \tfrac{1}{2}|v_3\rangle_{25}\big(be^{i\theta_1}|00\rangle - a|01\rangle - de^{i\theta_3}|10\rangle + ce^{i\theta_2}|11\rangle\big)_{36}.\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

When $n = 0$, qubits 3 and 6 will collapse into $be^{i\theta_0}|00\rangle - a|01\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}|10\rangle - ce^{i\theta_2}|11\rangle$, and the receiver can achieve the state $|T\rangle_{36} = (a|00\rangle + be^{i\theta_0}|01\rangle + ce^{i\theta_2}|10\rangle + de^{i\theta_3}|11\rangle)_{36}$ with the identity operator $I_3 \otimes Z_6X_6$. According to Step 4, Charlie introduces the ancillary qubits 7 and 8 into the state $|00\rangle_{78}$ and then

applies two controlled-NOT gates to obtain the desired state. Similarly, when $n = 1, 2, 3$, Charlie can choose the operators $I_3 \otimes X_6$, $Z_3 \otimes X_6$ and $Z_3 \otimes Z_6 X_6$ to obtain the state $|T\rangle_{36}$; that is, in this case, the success probability is 1 when $m = 1$.

Clearly, Alice can achieve four possible results in $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, and she will obtain one of the results for every measurement with the same possibility. Thus, the possibility of obtaining $m\,(m = 0, 1, 2, 3)$ is $1/4$. Similarly to when $m = 1$, the possibility of obtaining one of the other three states is also 1. Therefore, the total success probability can be calculated as below

$$P_{suc} = 4 \times \left(\frac{1}{4} \times 1\right) = 1. \tag{20}$$

3.2 Efficiency analysis

In RSP protocols, resource consumption, including quantum resources and classical information, is an important criterion used to evaluate a protocol. Taking five JRSP schemes for the preparation of cluster-type states–ZHM11, ABD11, WY12, WY13 and H13–as a reference, we perform analyses from the perspectives of quantum consumption, classical information consumption, number of controlled-NOT gates and success probability. For example, in the ZHM11 protocol, six Bell states (12 qubits) are needed as quantum resources for the preparation of a cluster-type state and 0 auxiliary qubits. In addition, the measurement results of four qubits (8 bits of classical information) are sent from the senders to the receiver, and no controlled-NOT gate is involved in the process. Using the above calculation method, we can obtain the efficiency information of the other four schemes (ABD11, WY12, WY13, H13) and our scheme (see Table 3.2).

Table 2: **Comparison between our scheme and analogous schemes.**

scheme	**quantum consumption (qbit)**	**classical information consumption (bit)**	**controlled-NOT gates (number)**	**success probability**
ZHM11	12(12+0)	8	0(0+0)	< 1
ABD11	8(6+2)	4	2(0+2)	< 1
WY12	9(8+1)	4	6(6+0)	< 1
WY13	10(6+4)	4	4(0+4)	< 1
H13	9(6+3)	4	4(2+2)	< 1
Our scheme	8(6+2)	6	2(0+2)	$= 1$

From the perspective of quantum consumption in Table 2, our scheme only needs 8 qubits, equivalent to ABD11 and fewer than the others. With respect to the classical information consumption, our scheme sends 6 bits of classical information, fewer than ABD11, WY12, WY13 and H13. Additionally, except for ZHM11, the time of $CNOT$ operation is the same as ABD11 and far less than WY12, WY13 and H13. Most importantly, the receiver can achieve unit success probability using our proposed scheme, whereas the success probabilities of the other schemes are less than 1. Therefore, our scheme is more economical and practicable.

Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a new scheme to realize the deterministic joint remote preparation of a four-qubit cluster-type state utilizing two GHZ states as quantum channels. In our scheme, the first sender performs a two-qubit projective measurement based on the real coefficient of the desired state. Then, the other sender performs another projective measurement utilizing the measurement result and the complex coefficient. To obtain the desired state, the receiver applies appropriate unitary operations to his/her own two qubits and two $CNOT$ operations to the two ancillary ones. The analysis revealed that our scheme requires fewer qubit resources, less classical information and no more $CNOT$ operations than most of the analogous schemes. Furthermore, the receiver can achieve the desired state with unit success probability. Hence, our scheme is somewhat more economical and feasible.

Acknowledgements This work is supported by the National Nature Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 61502101, and 61501247), the Priority Academic Program Development of Jiangsu Higher Education Institutions (PAPD), the Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province under Grant No. BK20140651.

References

1. Bennett C.H., Brassard G.: Quantum cryptography: public key distribution and coin tossing. In: Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India, 10C12 December 1984, pp. 175C179. IEEE Press, New York (1984)
2. Bennett C.H.: Quantum cryptography using any two nonorthogonal states. Phys. Rev. Lett 68(21), 3121C3124 (1992).
3. Liu Z.H., Chen H.W., Wang D., Li W.Q.: Cryptanalysis and improvement of three-particle deterministic secure and high bit-rate direct quantum communication protocol, Quantum Inf. Process. 13(6), 1345-1351 (2014).
4. Liu Z.H., Chen H.W., Wang D., Xue X.L.: Classical-operation-based deterministic secure quantum communication. Int. J. Theor. Phys. 53(6), 2118-2129 (2014).
5. Bennett C.H., Brassard G., Crepeau C., Jozsa R.: Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels. Phys. Rev. Lett. 70(13), 1895-1899 (1993).
6. Long L.R., Li H.W., Zhou P., Fan C., Yin C.L.: Multiparty-controlled teleportation of an arbitrary GHZ-class state by using a d-dimensional (N+2)-qubit nonmaximally entangled state as the quantum channel. Sci. China Phys. Mech. 54(3), 484-490 (2011).

7. Liu W.J., Liu C., Liu Z.H., Liu J.F., Geng H.T.: Same initial states attack in Yang et al.'s quantum private comparison protocol and the improvement. Int. J. Theor. Phys. 53, 271 (2014).
8. Liu W.J., Liu C., Chen H.W., Li Z.Q., Liu Z.H.: Cryptanalysis and improvement of quantum private comparison protocol based on Bell entangled states. Commun. Theor. Phys. 62, 210 (2014).
9. Liu W.J., Liu C., Wang H.B., Liu J.F., Wang F., Yuan X.M.: Secure Quantum Private Comparison of Equality Based on Asymmetric W State. Int. J. Theor. Phys. 53(6), 1804-1813 (2014).
10. Lo H.K.: Classical-communication cost in distributed quantum information processing: A generalization of quantum communication complexity. Phys. Rev. A 62(1), 012313 (2000).
11. Pati A.K.: Minimum classical bit for remote preparation and measurement of a qubit. Phys. Rev. A 63(1), 014302 (2000.
12. Bennett C.H., Divincenzo D.P., Shor P.W.: Smolin J.A., Terhal B.M., Wootters W.K.: Remote State Preparation. Phys. Rev. Lett. 87(7), 077902 (2001).
13. Liu Y.M., Zhang Y.M., Liu J., Zhang Z.J.: Remote preparation of three-particle GHZ class states. Commun. Theor. Phys. 49(2), 359-362 (2008).
14. Zhan Y.B.: Deterministic remote preparation of arbitrary two-and three-qubit states. EPL-Europhys Lett. 98(4), 40005 (2012).
15. Xia Y., Song J., Song H.S.: Multiparty remote state preparation. J. Phys. B-At. Mol. Opt. 40(18), 3719-3724 (2007).
16. An N.B., Kim J.: Collective remote state preparation. Int. J. Quantum Inf. 6(5), 1051-1066 (2008).
17. An N.B.: Joint remote state preparation via W and W-type states. Opt. Commun. 283(20), 4113-4117 (2010).
18. Liu W.J., Liu C., Chen H.W., Li Z.Q., Liu Z.H.: Cryptanalysis and improvement of quantum private comparison protocol based on Bell entangled states. Commun. Theor. Phys. 62, 210 (2014).
19. An N.B.: Joint remote preparation of a general two-qubit state. J. Phys. B-At. Mol. Opt. 42(12), 125501 (2009).
20. Wang D., Zha X.W., Lan Q.: Joint remote state preparation of arbitrary two-qubit state with six-qubit state. Opt. Commun. 284(24), 5853-5855 (2011).
21. Xiao X.Q., Liu J.M., Zeng G.: Joint remote state preparation of arbitrary two-and three-qubit states. J. Phys. B-At. Mol. Opt. 44(7), 075501 (2011).
22. Chen Q.Q., Xia Y., Song J., An N.B.: Joint remote state preparation of a W-type state via W-type states. Phys. Lett. A. 374(44), 4483-4487 (2010).
23. Luo M.X., Chen X.B., Ma S.Y., Niu X.X., Yang Y.X.: Joint remote preparation of an arbitrary three-qubit state[J]. Opt. Commun. 283(23), 4796-4801 (2010).
24. Chen Q.Q., Xia Y., An N.B.: Joint remote preparation of an arbitrary three-qubit state via EPR-type pairs. Opt. Commun. 284(10), 2617-2621 (2011).
25. Zhan Y.B., Hu B.L., Ma P.C.: Joint remote preparation of four-qubit cluster-type states. J. Phys. B-At. Mol. Opt. 44(9), 095501 (2011).
26. An N.B., Bich C.T., Van D.N.: Joint remote preparation of four-qubit cluster-type states revisited. J. Phys. B-At. Mol. Opt. 44(13), 135506 (2011).
27. Wang D., Ye L.: Probabilistic joint remote preparation of four-qubit cluster-type states with quaternate partially entangled channels. Int. J. Theor. Phys. 51(11), 3376-3386 (2012).
28. Wang D., Ye L.: Joint Remote Preparation of a Class of Four-Qubit Cluster-Like States with Tripartite Entanglements and Positive Operator-Valued Measurements. Int. J. Theor. Phys. 52(9), 3075-3085 (2013).
29. Hou K.: Joint remote preparation of four-qubit cluster-type states with multiparty. Quantum Inf. Process 12(12), 3821-3833 (2013).